

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RONALD WILLIAM CROCKER,

Defendant and Appellant.

G047730

(Super. Ct. No. 10CF0197)

O P I N I O N

Appeal from a judgment of the Superior Court of Orange County, Craig E. Robison, Judge. Affirmed.

Christian C. Buckley, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance by Plaintiff and Respondent.

*

*

*

Defendant Ronald William Crocker pleaded guilty to a violation of Penal Code section 288.7, subdivision (b) (oral copulation with a child 10 years old or younger by a person 18 years old or older). The court sentenced him to 15 years to life in prison.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. Appointed counsel filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 [87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493] (*Anders*) and *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*) setting forth the facts of the case and requesting that we independently review the record. Counsel stated he was unable to find any potential issues for review.

On July 24, 2013, this court provided defendant with 30 days to file written argument on his own behalf. That period of time has passed, and we have received no communication from defendant.

Testimony at the preliminary hearing by Santa Ana Police Officer Camillo Kim disclosed that the four-year-old victim's mother reported her child said defendant, their next door neighbor, "had licked his pee-pee." Santa Ana Detective Eva Lopez testified on proceedings during a forensic interview at the cast facility. The victim stated defendant's tongue touched his "pee-pee." The parties stipulated that penile DNA swabs were taken from the victim and his underwear, and that defendant's DNA was present on both swabs.

We have examined the entire record and reviewed counsel's *Anders/Wende* brief. We are satisfied the court properly advised defendant of his rights and the consequences of his plea before accepting the guilty plea. The sentence meets the requirements of Penal Code section 288.7, subdivision (b). Defendant's appellate counsel has fully complied with his responsibilities and no arguable issue exists. By virtue of counsel's compliance with the *Anders/Wende* procedure and our review of the record, defendant has received adequate and effective appellate review of the judgment entered against him in this case. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278 [120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756]; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 123–124.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

RYLAARSDAM, ACTING P. J.

WE CONCUR:

BEDSWORTH, J.

IKOLA, J.